

Merchant & Gould

An Intellectual Property Law Firm

Merchant & Gould P.C.
701 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4100
Seattle, WA 98104-7097

A Professional Corporation

Fax Transmission | May 14, 2007

TO:

Attn: Examiner Anh Ly
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

FROM: Ryan T. Grace

OUR REF: 50037.05USU1

Total pages, including cover letter: 4

PTO FAX NUMBER 1-571-273-4039

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 206.342.6200, or fax us at 206.342.6201.

Title of Document Transmitted: Applicant Initiated Interview Request FormApplicant: Ghim-Sim Chua et al.Serial No.: 09/927,096Filed: August 9, 2001Group Art Unit: 2162Our Ref. No. 50037.05USU1Confirmation No. 3792By: Name: Ryan T. GraceReg. No.: 52,956

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Tracy Gutscher
Signature5-14-07
Date

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/927,096

First Named Applicant: Chua

Examiner: Ly

Art Unit: 2162

Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Ly

(2)

(3) Ryan Grace

(4)

Proposed Date of Interview: Please call Proposed Time: Please call

Type of Interview Requested:(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide brief description:

Issues To Be Discussed

(1) 103 Rejection

(2)

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Independent claim 1 includes the following combination of features not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

a search engine manager configured to receive a search query from a client, access a search engine store to determine search engine wrappers that have registered a wrapper identifier with the search engine manager, and to translate the search query to a standard query, wherein the standard query is universally formatted for a plurality of search engine wrappers that have registered the wrapper identifier with the search engine manager, and to communicate the standard query from the search engine manager to each of the plurality of search engine wrappers that have registered the wrapper identifier with the search engine manager; and

each of the search engine wrappers being configured to translate the standard query to a native format query of a registered search engine associated with the search engine wrapper, wherein each of the search engine wrappers translates the standard query into a different native format, and to communicate the native format query to the registered search engine, the search engine wrapper being further configured to

return results from the registered search engine to the search engine manager.

The above combination of features is not taught in the cited references. The Office Action argues that Pan teaches the features of the search engine manager by teaching "receiving user input the query and then translate user input into a language that the search engines can accept and construct query command." See *Office Action* at pg. 4. This assertion leaves out many of the features of the cited search engine manager. For example, claim 1 states that the configuration manager translates "the search query to a standard query, wherein the standard query is universally formatted for a plurality of search engine wrappers that have registered the wrapper identifier with the search engine manager." Pan does not teach such a feature. Pan teaches translating the language (e.g. Chinese to English) of a query at a broker. The query is translated and provided directly to the search engine. Pan does not teach a standard query that is universally formatted for a plurality of search engine wrappers. Moreover, to have such a feature in Pan would destroy the very functionality of Pan's invention. The very purpose of Pan is to have the broker translate the query for a particular search engine. If the query from the client was translated to a universally formatted query, Pan would not be functional.


The Office Action also argues that Pan teaches that "every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine." This assertion leaves out many of the features of claim 1. The argument references the search engine. However, the cited portion of the claim pertains to the search engine wrapper. The argument in the Office Action has the search engine translating the search query and then communicating with itself to receive results from itself. Essentially, the Office Action is stating that the search engine is communicating with itself. This interpretation of the prior art and claim 1 is incorrect. The claims specifically set forth a "search engine manager", "a plurality of search engine wrappers," and a "search engine." The rejection attempts to piece together various functions that simply are not associated with the features as recited in claim 1. Moreover, to have such a wrapper in Pan would destroy the very functionality of Pan's invention. The very purpose of Pan is to have the broker translate the query for a particular search engine. If the query from the client was translated to a universally formatted query, Pan would not be functional.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that features associated with a "wrapper identifier." Applicants can find no such teaching in Pan or the other references. The Office Action relies on Chidlovskii in attempt to remedy the lack of teaching in Pan. Chidlovskii teaches a metadata search engine for ranking documents. With regard to a wrapper, Chidlovskii teaches that "[a]dditionally, the extended system may include wrappers that allow profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collects and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results." *Chidlovskii*, at col. 4, lines 46-55. Chidlovskii does not teach any of the functionality. Claim 1 specifically recites "each of the search engine wrappers being configured to translate the standard query to a native format query of a registered search engine associated with the search engine wrapper,

wherein each of the search engine wrappers translates the standard query into a different native format, and to communicate the native format query to the registered search engine, the search engine wrapper being further configured to return results from the registered search engine to the search engine manager." Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 1 is allowable.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____. NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

 5/8

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Ryan T. Grace

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

52,956

Registration Number, if applicable